UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,487	10/16/2003	Robert A. Rust	10991599-3	2149

7590 07/21/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
PUENTE, EMERSON C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2113	

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/688,487	RUST ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Emerson C. Puente	2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 April 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *21-62* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *21-60 and 62* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *61* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *16 October 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is supplemental to the Final Rejection filed 6/20/06. Examiner has included grounds of rejections relating to amended and new claims as well as responses to arguments not previously addressed in the Final Rejection filed 6/20/06.

Claims 1-20 have been cancelled. Claims 21-62 have been examined.
This action is made **FINAL.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 27, 36, 43, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In regards to claim 27, the limitation "wherein at least one of the subsequent transactions does not include a fault" is not disclosed in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Although the original specification at page 6, lines 3 that states "all further data transfers are disabled", there is no explicit teaching within the specification or other teaching(s) in the specification that inherently or necessarily implies "wherein at least one of the subsequent transactions does not include a fault". The limitation "all

further data transfers are disabled" does not inherently or necessarily imply "wherein at least one of the subsequent transactions does not include a fault", and, as such, there is not adequate support for the claim limitation.

In regards to claim 36, the limitation "wherein the subsequent transactions individually do not include a fault" is not disclosed in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Although the original specification at page 6, lines 3 that states "all further data transfers are disabled", there is no explicit teaching within the specification or other teaching(s) in the specification that inherently or necessarily implies "wherein the subsequent transactions individually do not include a fault". The limitation "all further data transfers are disabled" does not inherently or necessarily imply "wherein the subsequent transactions individually do not include a fault", and, as such, there is not adequate support for the claim limitation.

In regards to claim 43, the limitation "wherein the disabling comprises disabling communications of at least one of the others of the transaction not including a fault" is not disclosed in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Although the original specification at page 6, lines 3 that states "all further data transfers are disabled", there is no explicit teaching within the specification or other teaching(s) in the specification that inherently or necessarily implies "wherein the disabling comprises disabling communications of at least one of the others of the transaction not including a fault". The limitation "all further data transfers are disabled" does not inherently or necessarily imply

"wherein the disabling comprises disabling communications of at least one of the others of the transaction not including a fault", and, as such, there is not adequate support for the claim limitation.

In regards to claim 51, the limitation "wherein the at least some communications individually do not include a fault" is not disclosed in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Although the original specification at page 6, lines 3 that states "all further data transfers are disabled", there is no explicit teaching within the specification or other teaching(s) in the specification that inherently or necessarily implies "wherein the at least some communications individually do not include a fault". The limitation "all further data transfers are disabled" does not inherently or necessarily imply "wherein the at least some communications individually do not include a fault", and, as such, there is not adequate support for the claim limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 21-60 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,574,849 of Sonnier et al. referred hereinafter "Sonnier".

In regards to claim 21, Sonnier discloses:

storage circuitry configured to store digital data (see column 7 lines 13-35);

a plurality of components coupled with the storage circuitry and configured to communicate transactions with respect to one another and to process the transactions to effect operations with respect to storage of digital data using the storage circuitry (see figure 1a and column 10 lines 35-43 and column 7 lines 13-35); and

wherein at least one of the components is configured to detect a presence of a fault in a transaction communicated from an other of the components, and to disable communication of subsequent transactions from the other component to the one component after the detection of the transaction including the fault from the other component. Sonnier discloses the CRC of each message is checked at destination as well as while in route to the destination (ex. at each router crossing), indicating detecting a presence of a fault in a transaction communicated from an other of the components (see column 5 lines 35-40). He further discloses isolating a link or a router element that introduces an error, indicating disabling communication of subsequent transactions from the other component to the one component after the detection of the transaction including the fault from the other component (see column 5 lines 45-53).

In regards to claim 22, Sonnier discloses:

wherein the one component is configured to not process the transaction including the fault (see column 5 lines 45-53).

In regards to claim 23, Sonnier discloses:

a plurality of redundant storage circuits configured to redundantly store digital data. Sonnier discloses identical CPUs each with a memory (see figure 1a items 12a, 12b; figure 2 items 22, 28 and column 14 lines 7-12 and 50-60).

In regards to claim 24, Sonnier discloses:

a plurality of mirror circuits individually configured to effect storage operations with respect to both of the storage circuits (see figure 1a and column 6 lines 5-25).

In regards to claim 25, Sonnier discloses:

wherein the one component is configured to disable an interface in communication with the other component to disable the communication of the subsequent transactions (see column 5 lines 45-53).

In regards to claim 26, Sonnier discloses:

wherein the one component is configured to communicate and process transactions with respect to an additional component after the disablement of the communication of the subsequent transactions. Sonnier discloses isolating a link or router element that introduced an error (see column 5 lines 45-53). Since only the faulty link or router element that caused the error is isolated, the one component would continue processing transactions with respect to an additional component after the disablement of the communication of the subsequent transactions.

In regards to claim 27, Sonnier discloses:

wherein at least one of the subsequent transactions does not include a fault. Sonnier discloses isolating a link or router element that introduced an error (see column 5 lines 45-53). If there is isolation, then all of the communications of subsequent transactions are disabled, including subsequent transactions that would not include a fault.

In regards to claim 28, Sonnier discloses:

storage circuitry comprising a plurality of redundant storage circuits configured to redundantly store digital data. Sonnier discloses identical CPUs each with a memory (see figure 1a items 12a, 12b; figure 2 items 22, 28 and column 14 lines 7-12 and 50-60).

a plurality of components coupled with the storage circuitry and the components are configured to communicate transactions with respect to one another and to process received transactions to effect operations with respect to storage of digital data using the redundant storage circuits (see figure 1a and column 10 lines 35-43 and column 7 lines 13-35);

wherein the components are individually configured to identify transactions which include a fault, and to prevent processing of the transactions which have been identified as including a fault using the respective individual component. Sonnier discloses the CRC of each message is checked at destination as well as while in route to the destination (ex. at each router crossing), indicating identifying transactions which include a fault (see column 5 lines 35-40). He further discloses isolating a link or a router element that introduces an error, indicating preventing processing of the transactions which have been identified as including a fault using the respective individual component (see column 5 lines 45-53).

In regards to claim 29, Sonnier discloses:

wherein the transactions which include a fault are communicated from at least one of the components, and others of the components are configured to disable communications with respect to the one component to prevent the processing (see column 5 lines 45-53).

In regards to claim 30, Sonnier discloses:

wherein the others of the components are individually configured to disable a respective interface coupled with the one component to disable the communications (see column 5 lines 45-53).

In regards to claim 31, Sonnier discloses:

wherein the transactions for which processing was prevented would have otherwise been processed by recipient components (see column 5 lines 45-53).

In regards to claim 32, Sonnier discloses:

wherein the components are individually configured to prevent the respective processing responsive to the identification (see column 5 lines 45-53).

In regards to claim 33, Sonnier discloses:

wherein at least one of the components is configured to identify at least one of the transactions including a fault as being communicated from an other of the components and to prevent processing of subsequent transactions communicated from the other component after the identifying (see column 5 lines 45-53).

In regards to claim 34, Sonnier discloses:

wherein the one component is configured to process transactions from additional ones of the components after the identifying. Sonnier discloses isolating a link or router element that introduced an error (see column 5 lines 45-53). Since only the faulty link or router element that caused the error is isolated, the one component would continue processing transactions from additional ones of the components after the identifying.

In regards to claim 35, Sonnier discloses:

means for redundantly storing digital data. Sonnier discloses identical CPUs each with a memory (see figure 1a items 12a, 12b; figure 2 items 22, 28 and column 14 lines 7-12 and 50-60).

plural means for processing transactions for effecting operations with respect to the redundant storage of digital data (see figure 1a and column 10 lines 35-43 and column 7 lines 13-35);

wherein one of the means for processing is identified responsive to communication of a transaction including a fault from the one means for processing, and wherein subsequent transactions communicated from the identified means for processing which would otherwise be processed are not processed by at least one other of the means for processing responsive to the identification. Sonnier discloses the CRC of each message is checked at destination as well as while in route to the destination (ex. at each router crossing), indicating identifying transactions including a fault from the one means for processing (see column 5 lines 35-40). He further discloses isolating a link or a router element that introduces an error, indicating wherein subsequent transactions communicated from the identified means for processing which would otherwise be processed are not processed by at least one other of the means for processing responsive to the identification (see column 5 lines 45-53).

In regards to claim 36, Sonnier discloses:

wherein the subsequent transactions individually do not include a fault. Sonnier discloses isolating a link or router element that introduced an error (see column 5 lines 45-53). If there is isolation, then all of the subsequent transactions are disabled, including subsequent transactions that would not include a fault.

In regards to claim 37, Sonnier discloses:

wherein the other means for processing comprises means for disabling communications with respect to the one means for processing responsive to the identification (see column 5 lines 45-53).

In regards to claim 38, Sonnier discloses:

wherein the other means for processing comprises means for processing transactions of additional means for processing after the identification. Sonnier discloses isolating a link or router element that introduced an error (see column 5 lines 45-53). Since only the faulty link or router element that caused the error is isolated, the one component would continue processing transactions from additional ones of the components after the identifying.

In regards to claim 39, Sonnier discloses:

storing digital data using a data storage system (see column 7 lines 13-35);

communicating a plurality of transactions intermediate a plurality of components of the data storage system (see figure 1a and column 10 lines 35-43);

processing the transactions using the components (see column 7 lines 13-35);

using the components, effecting operations with respect to storage of digital data responsive to the processing (see column 7 lines 13-35);

identifying one of the transactions from one of the components as including a fault. Sonnier discloses the CRC of each message is checked at destination as well as while in route to the destination (ex. at each router crossing), indicating identifying one of the transactions from one of the components as including a fault (see column 5 lines 35-40); and

disabling communications of others of the transactions from the one component responsive to the identifying. Sonnier further discloses isolating a link or a router element that introduces an error, indicating disabling communications of others of the transactions from the one component responsive to the identifying (see column 5 lines 45-53).

In regards to claim 40, Sonnier discloses:

wherein the storing digital data comprises redundantly storing digital data using a plurality of redundant storage circuits of the data storage system. Sonnier discloses identical CPUs each with a memory (see figure 1a items 12a, 12b; figure 2 items 22, 28 and column 14 lines 7-12 and 50-60).

In regards to claim 41, Sonnier discloses:

disabling respective interfaces of the other components responsive to the identifying (see column 5 lines 45-53).

In regards to claim 42, Sonnier discloses:

processing transactions using the other components after the disabling. Sonnier discloses isolating a link or router element that introduced an error (see column 5 lines 45-53). Since only the faulty link or router element that caused the error is isolated, the one component would continue processing transactions using the other components after the disabling.

In regards to claim 43, Sonnier discloses:

disabling communications of at least one of the others of the transactions not including a fault. Sonnier discloses isolating a link or router element that introduced an error (see column 5 lines 45-53). If there is isolation, then all of the communications of subsequent transactions are disabled, including transactions that would not include a fault.

In regards to claim 44, Sonnier discloses:

storing digital data using storage circuitry of a data storage system (see column 7 lines 13-35), wherein storing comprises redundantly storing an identical data item of the digital data within individual ones of a plurality of redundant storage devices (see figure 1a items 12a, 12b; figure 2 items 22, 28 and column 14 lines 7-12 and 50-60);

providing a plurality of redundant components of the data storage system and individually configured to effect data storage operations of the storage circuitry (see figure 1a and column 10 lines 35-43 and column 7 lines 13-35)

identifying corruption of one of the components (see column 5 lines 35-40);

isolating the one of the components responsive to the identifying (see column 5 lines 45-53); and

after the isolating, providing redundant functionality of the isolated component using a redundant one of the components corresponding to the isolated component (see column 6 lines 5-25).

In regards to claim 45, Sonnier discloses:

using the data storage system, receiving the data item from externally of the data storage system during storage operations of the data storage system (see column 7 lines 15-26).

In regards to claim 46, Sonnier discloses:

where the providing redundant functionality comprises providing a transaction using the redundant component and corresponding to an isolated transaction of the isolated component (see column 6 lines 5-25).

In regards to claim 47, Sonnier discloses:

wherein the redundant component provides the same functionality as functionality of the isolated component (see column 14 lines 7-12).

In regards to claim 48, Sonnier discloses:

preventing processing of transactions from the isolated component which would have otherwise been processed. Sonnier discloses isolating a link or a router element that introduces an error, indicating preventing processing of transactions from the isolated component, which would have otherwise been processed (see column 5 lines 45-53).

In regards to claim 49, Sonnier discloses:

disabling communications of others of the components with respect to the isolated component (see column 5 lines 45-53).

In regards to claim 50, Sonnier discloses:

disabling at least some communications from the isolated component (see column 5 lines 45-53).

In regards to claim 51, Sonnier discloses:

wherein the at least some communications individually do not include a fault. Sonnier discloses isolating a link or router element that introduced an error (see column 5 lines 45-53). If there is isolation, then all of the communications of subsequent transactions are disabled, including some communications individually do not include a fault.

In regards to claim 52, Sonnier discloses:

wherein the components are configured to control redundant storage of a data item of the digital data within a plurality of different storage devices of the storage circuitry (see figure 1a items 12a, 12b; figure 2 items 22, 28 and column 14 lines 7-12 and 50-60).

In regards to claim 53, Sonnier discloses:

wherein different storage devices comprise a plurality of hard disk. Sonnier further discloses storing data on a number of different external elements, such as storage devices (see column 44 line 5-7 and 15-18), which also meets the limitation wherein the components are configured to control redundant storage of a data item of the digital data within a plurality of different storage devices of the storage circuitry. Sonnier defines disk storage as external storage (see column 2 lines 32-34), indicating wherein different storage devices comprise a plurality of hard disk.

In regards to claim 54, Sonnier discloses:

receiving the data item from a host system external of the data storage system during operations of the data storage system. Sonnier discloses elements external to the CPU may access the memory of the CPU (see column 7 lines 15-20). Sonnier further discloses memory operations such as read and write operations are permitted (see column 7 lines 24-25). As the external element is able to send or write to the memory, the external element constitute a host system receiving a data item.

In regards to claim 55, Sonnier discloses:

wherein at least one of the components is configured to monitor the presence of a parity error (see column 47 lines 7-10) and a protocol error (see column 27 lines 53-55) to detect the presence of the fault in the transaction.

In regards to claim 56, Sonnier discloses:

wherein the storage circuitry is configured to store an identical data item of the digital data within individual ones of a plurality of redundant storage devices of the storage circuitry to implement redundant storage (see figure 1a items 12a, 12b; figure 2 items 22, 28 and column 14 lines 7-12 and 50-60).

In regards to claim 57, Sonnier discloses:

wherein the redundant storage devices comprise a plurality of hard disks. Sonnier further discloses storing data on a number of different external elements, such as storage devices (see column 44 line 5-7 and 15-18), which also meets the limitation wherein the storage circuitry is configured to store an identical data item of the digital data within individual ones of a plurality of redundant storage devices of the storage circuitry to implement redundant storage. Sonnier defines disk storage as external storage (see column 2 lines 32-34), indicating wherein the redundant storage devices comprise a plurality of hard disks.

In regards to claim 58, Sonnier discloses:

wherein means for redundantly storing comprises means for redundantly storing a single data item in a plurality of storage devices (see figure 1a items 12a, 12b; figure 2 items 22, 28 and column 14 lines 7-12 and 50-60).

In regards to claim 59, Sonnier discloses:

wherein the storing comprises means for redundantly storing a single data item of the digital data in a plurality of storage devices (see figure 1a items 12a, 12b; figure 2 items 22, 28 and column 14 lines 7-12 and 50-60).

In regards to claim 60, Sonnier discloses:

wherein the storing comprises storing the single data item in the storage devices comprises hard disks. Sonnier further discloses storing data on a number of different external elements, such as storage devices (see column 44 line 5-7 and 15-18), which also meets the limitation wherein the storing comprises means for redundantly storing a single data item of the digital data in a plurality of storage devices. Sonnier defines disk storage as external storage (see column 2 lines 32-34), indicating wherein the storing comprises storing the single data item in the storage devices comprises hard disks.

In regards to claim 62, Sonnier discloses wherein the storing comprises storing the identical data item within the redundant storage devices comprising hard disks. Sonnier further discloses storing data on a number of different external elements, such as storage devices (see column 44 line 5-7 and 15-18), which also meets the limitation wherein the storing comprises redundantly storing an identical data item of the digital data within individual ones of a plurality of redundant storage devices. Sonnier defines disk storage as external storage (see column 2 lines 32-34), indicating wherein the storing comprises storing the identical data item within the redundant storage devices comprising hard disks.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 61 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed April 26, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument involving 112 rejection that cites: "To the contrary of the position of the Office, the original specification at page 6, lines 3 that states *all further data transfers* are disabled in one embodiment. It is understood by one of skill in the art the data transfers may include transactions which do not include a fault. Claim 27 is adequately described and the rejection under 112 is improper for at least this reason," (see page 10 of Remarks) examiner respectfully disagrees. Although it may be obvious that data transfers may include transactions that do not include a fault, one cannot provide support by suggesting it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. One may only show support based on explicit teaching within the specification or other teaching(s) in the specification that inherently or necessarily implies the teaching. Since there is no explicit teaching within the specification that cite "data transfer may include transactions which do not include a fault" and the limitation "all further data transfers" does not inherently or necessarily imply "transactions which do not include a fault", there is not adequate support for the claim limitation. Examiner maintains his rejection.

In response to applicant's argument regarding claim 35 involving a 112 rejection, examiner has withdrawn rejection. Argument is moot.

In response to applicant's argument regarding claim 21, 39, and 49 that cites the teachings with respect to one message packet having an incorrect CRC as disclosed in col. 5 of Sonnier fails to teach or suggest that communications are disabled, (see page 12, 13, and 14 of Remarks) examiner respectfully disagrees. The claim cites among other things "to disable communication of subsequent transactions from the other component to the one component after

the detection of the transaction including the fault from the other component". Sonnier discloses the CRC of each message is checked at destination as well as while in route to the destination (ex. at each router crossing), indicating detecting a presence of a fault in a transaction communicated from an other of the components (see column 5 lines 35-40). He further discloses isolating a link or a router element that introduces an error (see column 5 lines 45-53). If a router element were isolated, then there would be no communication of subsequent transactions from the other component to the router element, thus indicating disabling communication of subsequent transactions from the other component to the one component after the detection of the transaction including the fault from the other component. Examiner maintains his rejection.

In response to applicant's argument regarding claim 23, 28, 35, and 44 that the teachings do not disclose a plurality of redundant storage circuit configured to redundantly store digital data, (see page 12 and 13 of Remarks) examiner respectfully disagrees. Sonnier discloses identical or redundant CPU's, which are identical in structure and function (see column 14 lines 7-12). Sonnier also discloses wherein the identical or redundant CPU's include memory (see figure 2 item 22 and 28) and writing data to the memory (see column 14 lines 55-60). Since the CPU's are redundant or identical, then the memories would be identical or redundant, indicating a plurality of redundant storage circuit configured to redundantly store digital data. Examiner maintains his rejection.

In response to applicant's argument regarding claim 25 that cites "the identified teaches fails to mention interface let alone disablement thereof," (see page 12 of Remarks) examiner respectfully disagrees. The claim cites among other things "to disable an interface in communication with the other components to disable the communication of the subsequent

transactions." Sonnier discloses isolating a link or a router element that introduces an error (see column 5 lines 45-53). If a router element were isolated, there would be no communication between the elements. If there is no communication, then the interface of the component would not be able to communicate with other components, thus indicating disablement of the interface in communication with the other components to disable the communication of the subsequent transactions. Examiner maintains his rejection.

In response to applicant's argument regarding claim 48 that cites, "Sonnier fails to disclose or suggest preventing processing of transactions from the isolated component which would have otherwise been processed," examiner respectfully disagrees. Sonnier discloses isolating a link or a router element that introduces an error (see column 5 lines 45-53). If a router element was isolated, then the element would not be able to communicate, thus preventing processing of transactions from the isolated component which would have otherwise been processed. Examiner maintains his rejection.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emerson C. Puente whose telephone number is (571) 272-3652. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert W. Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ecp
7/12/06

ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100